

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-5, 7-29, and 31-36 are pending.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5, 7-29, and 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 5,583,560 to Florin et al. (hereinafter, "Florin"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,163,316 to Killian (hereinafter, "Killian"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

In the present Office Action, the Office recognizes that Florin does not disclose:

"displaying the primary display screen on a television through a web browser program", as recited in independent claims 1 and 33 (Office Action pp. 2 and 7, respectively);

"displaying the primary display screen through a web browser program", as recited in independent claims 20, 26, and 34-35 (Office Action pp. 4, 5, and 7 respectively);

"the primary display screen comprises a screen image displayed through an interactive display environment including World Wide Web content", as recited in independent claim 29 (Office Action p.6); or

"the primary display screen being displayed through a web browser program", as recited in independent claim 36 (Office Action p.7).

ı

Thus, the Office cites Killian for the recognized deficiencies of Florin. Applicant respectfully disagrees that "Killian discloses displaying a television channel on a web page" at col. 5, lines 1-29 as the Office suggests (Office Action p.2). Further, Killian does not disclose a web browser program, or suggest "displaying the primary display screen on a television through a web browser program", as recited in claim 1 for example.

Killian describes a television system that includes an application which synchronizes and integrates television signals and Internet information for display on a television (col.3, lines 20-23). Killian describes obtaining program listing information and Internet information corresponding to a particular television channel via a link to the Internet (cols. 3-5). The Internet information corresponding to the particular television channel is integrated with a decoded television signal for the particular channel and the integrated information is communicated to a television for viewing (col.5, lines 1-29).

Killian actually teaches away from the present application in that Killian describes displaying Internet information on a television. This is in opposite to displaying television through a web browser program, as recited in the independent claims of the present application. For example, Killian describes that a regular television broadcast is in a first display area on a television and Internet information is in a second display area on the television (col.5, lines 30-33). This is contrary to "displaying the primary display screen on a television through a web browser program", as recited in claim 1.

Killian does not disclose a web browser program or even suggest "displaying the primary display screen on a television through a web browser program", as recited in claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over the Florin-

Killian combination and Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection be withdrawn.

In addition to claim 1, independent claims 20, 26, 29, 33, 34, 35, and 36 are also allowable over the Florin-Killian combination for the reasons described above. Furthermore, the Florin-Killian combination does not teach or suggest the combination of elements recited in independent claims 1, 20, 26, 29, and 33-36. Accordingly, the §103 rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 and 7-19 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 1 (either directly or indirectly).

Claims 21-25 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 20 (either directly or indirectly).

Claims 27-28 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 26. Claims 31-32 are allowable by virtue of their dependency upon claim 29.



Conclusion

Pending claims 1-5, 7-29, and 31-36 are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests issuance of the subject application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned attorney before issuing a subsequent Action.

By:

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: Aug. 15, 2002

David A. Morasch Reg. No. 42,905 (509) 324-9256 x 210